

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 9-11 are now pending in this application, with claim 11 being the only independent claim. Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Independent claim 11 is amended to address the claim objections and removes the recitations of “drive controllers”. The recitation of drive controllers in the claims related to the motor controllers for the plate cylinder motor and knife cylinder motor described in the specification, for example, at paragraph 0011, line 3 and paragraph 0013, line 4. However, since these motor controllers are not shown in the drawings, the recitations of “drive controllers” are removed from the claim. Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested as not requiring further search and or consideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 9, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 4,283,975 (Knoll) in view of Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Independent claim 11 recites “printing the web with the repeated sequence of at least two printed pages with different heights in a web-fed rotary printing press having a plate cylinder driven by a plate cylinder motor, wherein the repeated sequence of at least two printed pages with different heights is printed for each rotation of the plate cylinder” and “cutting the printed web transversely to said running direction successively to form different sheets corresponding to the at least two printed pages with different heights”. Furthermore, the step of cutting includes the substeps of “predefining at least two different movement sequences for the cutting cylinder motor in the computing and storage unit and storing the movement sequences in

a memory in the computing and storage unit, each of the different movement sequences being associated with one of the different heights of the printed pages”, “communicating a rotary position of the plate cylinder from the plate cylinder motor to the computing and storage unit”, and “selecting one of the movement sequences from the memory based on the communicated rotary position of the plate cylinder and transferring corresponding instructions to the cutting cylinder motor”.

Knoll fails to teach or suggest the above limitations because Knoll fails to teach or suggest (1) cutting the printed web to form different sheets corresponding to the at least two printed pages with different heights, wherein the repeated sequence of the at least two printed pages with different heights is printed for each rotation of the plate cylinder; and (2) selecting a movement sequence from a memory based on the communicated rotary position of the plate cylinder, as expressly recited in independent claim 11.

Knoll relates to a system for setting the sheet length on a cross-cutter for webs of material. According to Knoll, a desired sheet-length is entered on a decade box 21 (see col. 3, lines 28-29 of Knoll), and forwarded to a computer which delivers appropriate values to three control loops: a control loop for an irregular-motion mechanism 6, a control loop for a continuously variable speed transmission 5a; and a control loop for a speed changing mechanism 5b (col. 3, lines 29-34).

The first control loop measures an actual sheet-length and compares this to the desired sheet length (col. 3, lines 39-56). The third control loop performs a coarse adjustment of speed for a sheet size (col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 10). As described in Knoll, the precise adjustment using the second control loop takes several steps (col. 4, lines 39-42).

In the Advisory Action mailed on March 6, 2007, the Examiner indicated that the claims do not specifically state that the sheets of different height alternate. Independent claim 11 has been amended to clarify that "the repeated sequence of at least two printed pages with different heights is printed for each rotation of the plate cylinder". Since Knoll discloses that the precise adjustment to a desired sheet-length takes several steps, and since there is no indication that the decade box receives more than one desired sheet length at one time, Knoll fails to teach or suggest "cutting the printed web transversely to said running direction successively to form different sheets corresponding to the at least two printed pages with different heights", "wherein the repeated sequence of at least two printed pages with different heights is printed for each rotation of the plate cylinder", as now expressly recited in independent claim 11.

Independent claim 11 further recites that the step of cutting includes the substeps "predefining at least two different movement sequences for the cutting cylinder motor in the computing and storage unit and storing the movement sequences in a memory in the computing and storage unit, each of the different movement sequences being associated with one of the different heights of the printed pages" and "selecting one of the movement sequences from the memory based on the communicated rotary position of the plate cylinder and transferring corresponding instructions to the cutting cylinder motor". The Office Action does not expressly describe where these limitations are found or how they are taught.

There is no indication that Knoll stores two different movement sequences or that Knoll selects one of the movement sequences based on the communicated rotary position of the plate cylinder, as recited in claim 11. Knoll merely stores minimum and maximum values for each speed and adjusts itself using control loops to a desired sheet length input to the decade box. Even if Knoll is considered to select a speed, that selection is not "based on the communicated

rotary position of the plate cylinder”, as recited in claim 11. Rather, Knoll bases the speed on a signal delivered by the computer (col. 3, lines 60-62) which is based on the desired sheet length entered at the decade box 21 (col. 3, lines 28-34). Accordingly, Knoll fails to disclose “selecting one of the movement sequences from the memory based on the communicated rotary position of the plate cylinder”, as expressly recited in independent claim 11.


The AAPA fails to teach or suggest what Knoll lacks. AAPA merely discloses printing a web and fails to disclose, teach or suggest anything about “cutting the printed web transversely to said running direction successively to form different sheets corresponding to the at least two printed pages with different heights”, as expressly recited in independent claim 11.

According to the above remarks, independent claim 11 is allowable over Knoll in view of AAPA and the rejection of independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 9-10 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 11 as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By 
Alfred W. Froeblich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: March 30, 2007